

IN THE  
**ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS**  
DIVISION TWO

---

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,  
*Appellee,*

*v.*

RANDALL LEE LYMAN,  
*Appellant.*

No. 2 CA-CR 2014-0145  
Filed December 26, 2014

---

THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND  
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

*See* Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. 111(c); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.24.

---

Appeal from the Superior Court in Pima County

No. CR20131684001

The Honorable Casey F. McGinley, Judge

**AFFIRMED**

---

COUNSEL

Lori J. Lefferts, Pima County Public Defender  
By Michael J. Miller, Assistant Public Defender, Tucson  
*Counsel for Appellant*

STATE v. LYMAN  
Decision of the Court

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

Presiding Judge Miller authored the decision of the Court, in which Chief Judge Eckerstrom and Judge Espinosa concurred.

---

M I L L E R, Presiding Judge:

¶1 After a jury trial, appellant Randall Lyman was convicted of three counts of sexual conduct with a minor under the age of fifteen and one count of furnishing obscene or harmful items to a minor. The trial court imposed consecutive life sentences without the possibility of release for thirty-five years for the sexual conduct counts and a consecutive 2.5-year prison term for furnishing obscene materials to a minor.

¶2 Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, 2 P.3d 89 (App. 1999), asserting he has reviewed the record but found no arguable issue to raise on appeal. Consistent with *Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 32, 2 P.3d at 97, he has provided “a detailed factual and procedural history of the case with citations to the record” and asks this court to search the record for error. Lyman has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶3 Viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to sustaining the verdicts, *see State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999), sufficient evidence supports the jury’s verdicts. That evidence demonstrates that Lyman, on at least three occasions, had either placed his penis “between [the victim’s] legs” and moved it back and forth, or made her touch his penis. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-1401(3), 13-1405(A). On at least one occasion, he showed her a pornographic video. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-3501, 13-3506(A). All of the conduct occurred when the victim, Lyman’s stepdaughter, was under twelve years old. Lyman’s prison terms are within the

STATE v. LYMAN  
Decision of the Court

statutory limit and were imposed properly. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-702(B), 13-705(A), (B), 13-1405(B), 13-3506(C).

¶4 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental, reversible error and found none. *See State v. Fuller*, 143 Ariz. 571, 575, 694 P.2d 1185, 1189 (1985) (stating *Anders* requires court to search record for fundamental error). Accordingly, we affirm Lyman's convictions and sentences.